



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/799,901

03/12/2004

Duck-Sung Kim

2060-3102

8302

35884

7590

06/24/2008

LEE, HONG, DEGERMAN, KANG & SCHMADEKA
660 S. FIGUEROA STREET
Suite 2300
LOS ANGELES, CA 90017

EXAMINER

SINGH, RAMNANDAN P

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2614

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

06/24/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

DETAILED ACTION

(I) Claim Rejection:

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3 Claims 1-4, 9-12, 13 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Raith et al. (6,073,005).

 Regarding claim 15, Raith et al. teaches a communication unit, e.g., mobile unit 200, which is programmed to check a call number against a plurality of recognized emergency call numbers, determining whether the call number starts with one of the plurality of recognized emergency call numbers and whether the call number contains the same number of digits as the one of the plurality of recognized emergency call numbers.

Reference is made to column 1, lines 55-57; line 66 through column 2, line 2; column 4, line 60 through column 5, line 17; lines 28-35; and lines 43-61. Raith et al. specifically teaches, starting at column 5, line 50 where the mobile unit substitutes the correct emergency contact number (which is broadcast to the system) and replace the user's dialed home emergency number with the broadcast number.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art, if not inherent to Raith et al., to have generated an input error warning when there was a mismatch between the dialed number and the substituted broadcast

emergency number. The motivation for providing the notification is such that the user would be aware of the correct emergency number if they had to redial or relay the information to another party.

Claim 9 would be similar to that for claim 15.

Regarding claims 10-12, the limitations are shown above.

(II) With respect to the other independent claims (1 and 13), the concept is to prevent call errors by comparing digits that are entered, determine the number of digits dialed, determine the accuracy of a "call service code", determine if the call number contains the same number of digits as the recognized call service code and/or generating a warning if there is a mismatch in numbers dialed. The "communication unit" could read on a PBX, central office, intelligent switch, etc.

The comparison of numbers in a telephony system is old and well established in the art. For example:

Pulver (6,741,835) teaches a system that analyzes dialed numbers, such as information or emergency numbers or even area codes and then counts

the digits, in order to prompt a user to generate a SEND command (column 6, lines 35-53).

Nemeth (6,310,948) teaches a method and apparatus for analyzing international long distance dialing errors and automatically completing a call if the error can be determined, i.e., recognizing dialed country codes (service code), and also providing an error warning to the user, see Abstract; column 3, lines 54-59.

Forbes (6,775,538) teaches the feature of a dialed number comparator for facilitate identification of priority numbers, for example emergency numbers or high priority numbers, see column 13, lines 17-21.

Feinberg et al. (7,006,614) teaches a system wherein a users dialed digits are collected and analyzed to determine if the number is a valid or invalid number, "e.g., an incomplete number or the like" (column 90, lines 61-65). If invalid, then an error tone is provided. Feinberg et al. also suggests on column 46, lines 45-66, that in order to place a call, a user would have to enter an account number (read as a service code). The number is compared against a stored number and a warning is provided to the user if the number does not match, i.e., an incomplete or inaccurate number.

(III) To address the motivation to teach or suggest requiring a communication terminal to provide an error indication before a misdialled number of a recognized call service code is transmitted to a call center, this motivation is provided by Wong et al. (6,760,432) which teaches on column 1, lines 20-29, "Applicants have noted that it is sometimes undesirable to press "Send" button in order for the telephone to search for the complete number which is the best match [to] (sic) the partial number entered. The wrong number may be selected, and a (potentially expensive) phone call will have been begun. Wrong numbers are especially likely when it is unknown how many digits are in the number. A speed-dial number typically has two digits, a local number has seven, a long distance number has ten or eleven, and an international number has even more." The motivation taught here by Wong et al. in combination with any of the aforementioned references, would render obvious applicants independent claims.

Regarding claims 2-4, the limitations are shown above.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments filed March 19, 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant's argument---“ Raith does not teach the "determining whether the call number contains the same number of digits as a recognized call service code" and "generating an input error warning if the call number starts with the recognized call service code and if the call number does not contain the same number of digits as the recognized call service code." Applicant submits that a prima facie case for obviousness has not been shown and that claims 1, 13, and 15 are not obvious over the cited prior art” on page 7.

Examiner's response—Examiner respectfully disagrees. The comparison of numbers in a telephony system is old and well established in the art. For details, Applicant is directed to the claim rejection (Para: II thru Para: III) as set forth above.

Conclusion

5. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the

THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ramnandan Singh whose telephone number is (571) 272-7529. The examiner can normally be reached on M-TH (8:00-5:30).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Fan Tsang can be reached on (571) 272-7547. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/ Ramnandan Singh/
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2614
